UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Current Problems of Unitarianism - - - - - - - - - - *Herbert H. Stroup*

The Importance of Feeling Important - - - - - - - - - *Edward Podolsky*

The Pope and the Rotary Club - - - - - - - - - - *Peter H. Samsom*

The Shackles of Family Affection - - - - - - - - - - *Ethel S. Beer*

Alexander Pushkin: A Liberal Poet in Bondage - - - - - - - - - *Leonard B. Gray*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXL No. 3

Chicago, September-October, 1954

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Except During July-August

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

CONTRIBUTORS

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

Leonard B. Gray: Minister of the Second Congregational Church, East Douglas, Massachusetts.

Harold P. Marley: Psychiatric Social Worker for the State of Illinois.

Edward Podolsky: Physician in Brooklyn, New York.

Peter H. Samsom: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of San Diego, California.

Herbert H. Stroup: Professor in Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—Curtis W. Reese 35

ARTICLES—

Current Problems of Unitarianism—Herbert H. Stroup 36

The Importance of Feeling Important—Edward Podolsky 38

The Pope and the Rotary Club—Peter H. Samsom 39

The Shackles of Family Affection—Ethel S. Beer 42

Alexander Pushkin: A Liberal Poet in Bondage—Leonard B. Gray 44

THE STUDY TABLE—

An Undreamer—Harold P. Marley 46

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 47

THE FIELD—

The California Tax Loyalty Oath—*A.C.L.U. Bulletin* 34

THE FIELD

The California Tax Loyalty Oath

Three San Francisco World War II combat veterans, including Lawrence Speiser, staff counsel of the Northern California ACLU branch, have filed suits to test the constitutionality of the 1953 state law requiring loyalty oaths for veterans' tax exemptions.

Challenging the statute, which was opposed before its passage in 1952 by both the Northern and Southern California ACLU branches, Speiser, Gabriel Lehrer and Daniel Prince declared that the loyalty oath requirement for securing veterans' exemptions on property taxes violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments and abridges freedom of conscience. The three men refused to sign the loyalty oath appended to their tax assessment forms, and were therefore refused tax exemptions by their County Assessors. Speiser is also serving as co-counsel for the other two men.

The California legislation as applied to veterans previously has been challenged by the Southern California ACLU branch in behalf of Nathaniel Bliss. It is also the basis of a suit filed by the First Methodist Church of San Leandro and supported by the ACLU of Northern California, attacking the law's provision requiring loyalty oaths from religious organizations seeking property tax exemptions.

The statute, which also covers individuals claiming deductions for donations to religious, charitable, scientific, literary, social welfare and educational organizations, requires the taxpayer to affirm that he "does not advocate the overthrow of the United States or the State of California by force or violence or other unlawful means, nor advocate the support of a foreign government against the United States in event of hostilities."

A.C.L.U. Bulletin

UNITY

Volume CXL SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1954 NUMBER 3

EDITORIAL

The American dream is that of a free country where free men may think freely and express themselves freely, without fear that some officious official is leering over either the left or the right shoulder. By and large this dream has prevailed in America until very recent times. But now a relatively few demagogues, using Nazi and Soviet patterns, have thrown a fright into the body politic that tends to paralyze thought and strangle opposition. Undoubtedly there is a handful of subversive Communists who should and can be dealt with effectively under existing laws and regulations. The really dangerous subversives today are the McCarthys who strive to suppress freedom of thought, speech, press, and assembly. Even the Fifth Amendment, one of the most sacred Articles of the Constitution, is being treated with utter disdain. In my book anyone who strives to bring disrepute to any Article of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States is a subversive of the first order, whether he be a Communist or a U. S. Senator. It is high time for plain speech in these United States. And I, for one, do not intend to be silenced by tinhorn demagogues. Fortunately the most blatant of present-day demagogues is now being investigated by a Committee of his peers in the U. S. Senate. At this writing there is no indication of what the outcome will be. But this much is certain, if the U. S. Senate has proper respect for its reputation, the result will be a vote of censure in no uncertain terms. Such a result would be fair warning that the highest legislative body in the world will not stand for irresponsible conduct on the part of its members. The Senate should set an example to the rest of the country and show its respect for the American dream and its intention to see that the American dream prevails in official circles. But the real guaranty of the survival of the American dream is in the minds and hearts of the citizens of the Republic. It is they who must cherish liberty to such an extent that subversives of either the right or the left cannot gain a foothold in our political life. Individual citizens must not be afraid to stand up and be counted. They must not cower under the onslaughts of bigots. They must fight with all the instrumentalities provided by our Constitution. And above all, they must practice the liberties indicated by the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States of America.

Curtis W. Reese.

Current Problems of Unitarianism

HERBERT H. STROUP

Unitarianism by its very nature is open to constant change. Its history is a vivid record of vital change. Yet, today, Unitarianism is faced with challenges which require more far-reaching changes than ever before in its history. In some ways the changes now being faced strike to its very foundations.

Sociologically speaking, Unitarianism fits a prior period in American history more than it does today. Two chief social factors which historically encouraged the growth of Unitarianism as a "common faith" have been: (1) frontier expansiveness, (2) capitalistic individualism.

Frontier expansiveness aided various Protestant denominations, some more than others. The Baptists and Methodists were more capable of geographic and churchly expansion both because of the nature of their ecclesiastical organization and because of their relative lack of scholarly requirements for their clergy. Unitarianism, aside from coming too late to partake fully in the frontier movement, did not qualify for men's minds as quickly and basically as did certain other Protestant sects. But Unitarianism was able to expand somewhat as the country expanded in population and in its westward reach. The frontier spirit, essentially one of belief in ever-possible general expansion, stimulated Unitarianism in its theology more than in its social influence over American life. Thus, Unitarianism, with its disdain for the static, has expressed a basic element in the native American spirit.

Capitalistic individualism also provided a favorable atmosphere in which Unitarianism could grow. There are perhaps two main aspects to capitalistic individualism. First, capitalism in its more strikingly creative days in this country implied and supported a general philosophy of progress, especially of material progress. Secularism and humanism have had a more fertile soil on which to grow in this country than anywhere else in the world, with the possible exception of modern Russia. Unitarianism in part was the theological and social expression of a resounding confidence in man's ability to create the Kingdom of God.

The second factor, closely connected with capitalism, is that of individualism. Unitarianism proudly has placed prime emphasis upon the role of the individual in religion. It developed further than most Protestant groups the Reformation doctrine of the right of the individual to steer his own course in the sea of cosmic faith.

Both frontier expansiveness and capitalistic individualism have certain common denominators which reflect basic assumptions in American culture during the past three hundred years.

The present dilemma of Unitarianism derives not from any essential modification of its own social structure of theologic meaning. The cultural conditions, however, which have nurtured it have been greatly changed. The postulates on which it has been built historically are not longer operative to such a degree in American culture. New values have taken the place of old. Does Unitarianism, then, as it has developed in this country, express merely the religious needs of a particular time and place or are there values within it which in part transcend the cultural conditions out of which it has grown? How best can modern Unitarianism meet the challenge of the new social environment which has developed about it?

No one person, within Unitarianism or without, can adequately answer these questions. Nor would rational answers provide an essential solution. Religious movements are more than their carefully formulated doctrines, and prophets are slow to win converts.

Some of the features of the current problems of Unitarianism can be sketched at this time with the hope that other facets will be noted by other analysts. The work of many will be required in order to provide suitable questions and answers.

One of the perennial aspects of the current dilemma of Unitarianism is its inability to decide to what extent the movement should show loyalty toward the old and to what extent it is devoted to the new. In other words: To what extent should Unitarians rejoice in the accomplishments of their past, being loyal to them, also, in the present? Should present-day Unitarians be bound by anything in their heritage?

It is safe to say that while Unitarian theology has shown some incidental changes in the last one hundred years its overall character has been relatively static. Unitarians today believe pretty much what their ancestors did many decades ago. "Loyalty to ever-unfolding truth" has apparently led to few new substantial disclosures of truth.

Unitarian modes of worship also have been relatively unchanged in the American history of the movement. The typical Unitarian service with its derogation of religious feeling and over-emphasis on intellectualism has met with favor from only a select few.

So, in various aspects, current Unitarianism remains relatively unchanged, compared to any point in its worthy history.

The fact that it has remained basically unchanged would not disturb most other denominations. It scarcely disturbs most Unitarians. But increasingly it seems to be an unsettling factor in Unitarian discussions. Unitarian voices are currently asking: Where next should we go? Should there be Unitarian advance? Can there be such an advance? What might it be like, if it came? In a religion like Unitarianism, what roles have the old and new to play?

To some degree the current discussions regarding Unitarianism's relation to Christianity present another feature of its general dilemma. They also comprise a facet of Unitarianism's uncertainty regarding the old and the new.

The debate as to whether Unitarianism is a sect within Christendom or a basic, universal faith—a debate which probably will grow and not diminish—is symptomatic of Unitarianism's present inability to understand its nature and mission. The issue put in other terms is: How adequate can a particularistic religion be in meeting the need of the world for a fundamentally unifying faith? Is it possible that Unitarianism is the spiritual hope of the world or do we "look for another"?

Those Unitarians who look to Christianity as a world-embracing religion and to Unitarianism as simply

a small force within Christianity are apparently unable to rationalize successfully the relationships of the two movements. Do Unitarians in their need for universalism, need to join forces with the larger Christian movement? If so, how can they do so and still retain their traditional individuality?

On the other hand, those Unitarians who look for the emergence of a world faith in which apparently Unitarianism would supply a large share of the instigating dynamics are seemingly unable to put very much concrete meaning into the term "world faith." Can Unitarians successfully engineer the construction and acceptance of a world faith? How can that faith be more than a sententious set of familiar platitudes?

The development of relationships between Unitarians and liberal Jews undoubtedly will influence the ultimate decision in this matter.

Unitarianism has been the religion of certain select social classes. It has obviously been lacking in mass appeal. Unitarians have been divided historically on the proper societal function of the denomination. There are those who say openly that Unitarianism should only be conceived as an upper class religion. They point avidly to Unitarian representation in the Hall of Fame or *Who's Who,* as though the prominence of a few Unitarians excused the failure of the movement to win acceptance from socially average or less than average persons. Unitarianism, moreover, has had a minimum of influence in the industrial and agricultural classes of this country.

On the other hand, there are those who vaguely feel that Unitarianism should be attracting large numbers of the American masses. On them lies the burden of proving how such an attraction should be organized. Can the masses be won by the uncompromising character of Unitarianism in regard to "superstition"? To what degree must "superstition" be a part of every religion which claims the minds of the masses? Can the masses accept a largely intellectual form of religion? Do they need such a religion?

No matter how one may attempt to solve the dilemma of mass versus class, it is evident that Unitarianism has failed to attract even a fraction of the classes that it pretends to claim for its very own. Economically speaking, Episcopalians and Presbyterians are the largest denominations attracting potential Unitarians. What do these groups offer which has enabled them to succeed to a greater extent than Unitarianism? Which should come first in any campaign to strengthen Unitarianism: an appeal to the masses or to the classes?

Another facet of the current problem of Unitarianism concerns the relationships betwen theology and social action. Unitarianism, especially among the laity, has been known as a movement with a minimum of theology. Is this condition or reputation a proper reflection of man's general inability to grasp with certainty the "thing-in-itself"? Or does it represent a lack of concern for theology or even an inability to deal thoughtfully with it on the part of Unitarians?

Social action measures among Unitarians commonly assume two forms: (1) efforts to alleviate human suffering where it is directly and concretely found; (2) efforts to reconstruct the social environment in accord with spiritual principles. The first of these efforts has very greatly outweighed the second. To put it another way: the budget of the Unitarian Service Committee is very much larger than that of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice. Unitarians obviously find it easier to express their religious faith in terms of philanthropy than in terms of social justice.

But the relation between theology and social action (in the second sense) of Unitarians causes many to be perplexed. Unitarians generally are radicals in theology but notable conservatives in regard to social justice. It is easy to condemn those traditional Christians who do not act in accord with their theological presuppositions—and many Unitarian pulpits sound that note. But is it not as easy to condemn those who express radicalism in theology and conservatism in politics? The clue for this divorce in Unitarianism, of course, lies in the fact that so many Unitarians are members of the educated upper classes. They find it relatively easy to break through the chains of a theology which is no longer widely accepted, but are unable to sever their bonds to family, friends, and community to the same degree.

These four factors in the current problem of Unitarianism are not meant to be exhaustive. Answers, as has been said, cannot be given by any one person or group within Unitarianism. But answers must be found before Unitarianism as a broad social and religious movement can meet the cultural challenges which it faces today.

The Hills of Home

Man's insistent demands for security are but mental cloudbursts of immaturity. He whimpers for the moon when earth is his and all the fullness thereof. As a child, man craves that which he cannot reach, and his lack of confidence in himself betrays his fear in all of life. If it is a miracle he yearns for, let him study the history of his own kind. If it is gods he looks for, let him mirror himself in a placid pool. If it is evil that frights him, let him return to the pool and gaze therein.

Out of the forest of time man comes into the meadows of the now. The bright sunlight too often dazzles him and it is with great difficulty that he sees at all. The very shadows that appear in the distance are but mountains locking in the lea. The rustle of the wind is an antiphonal, not the wailings of the nether demons. The roar of the cataracts is no evil sprite bellowing, but 'tis harped music of the dancing waters, skipping and singing onward to the restless sea.

The soaring birds are feathered harbingers of the Spring, not omens of the dread unknown. Awaken man! 'Tis life that's yours. Go, climb yon mountain and see a vaster world. Go, see the waterfall and learn to bridge and use it. Make thy bed upon the clean earth and draw a cloud upon thee as a coverlet. Sleep to the harped music of the waterfall and rise, locked-arms, with the sun and the sky. This is thy home—thy habitation—and it is a good land; a good life is thine but for the choosing.

The leafy hosts of glade nod in approval as man takes his first faltering steps toward the hills; the doves coo in applause and the meadow grass bends in courtesy to the advent of the ascent. The trip is none too difficult, but 'tis the urge to make it that counts. Man can never know the thrill of pinnacle gaze until he leaves the lowlands of his past. There is not a barrier of valid account and the course is clear-marked: upward and onward—toward the hills of hope where lies man's true destiny.

J. Ray Shute.

The Importance of Feeling Important

EDWARD PODOLSKY

One of our most significant personality attributes is the will. By exercising the will, the individual rises above his animal status into the realm of freedom, independence, and dignity. All sentient beings are always striving for some goal. The striving for importance is a normal and wholly natural process.

All of us at one time or another undergo a process of self-idealization; self-idealization, of necessity, entails self-glorification, and by means of self-glorification some of us achieve a sense of importance. This is the least socially acceptable means of attaining importance. Importance is far more than self-glorification or self-idealization. It is not a selfish process. It calls for a wholesome and outgoing relatedness to others.

For most of us, striving for importance also means striving for happiness. For many, feeling important is identical with happiness. Importance has many meanings for many people. For some the striving for importance means the attaining of physical perfection; for others it means the achievement of intellectual maturity. For still others, being important signifies abundant economic security which in their case implies abundant possessions, a great deal of money, and all the prestige that money can buy.

For too many, being important means power. Power is the ruling passion in the lives of quite a few people. Power also has many meanings for many people. Some gain spiritual power in religious activity. Others acquire a strong faith in something which makes them relatively invulnerable (a political, economic, or literary movement). Still others gain power by acquiring great wealth or by rising to positions of great influence. The exercise of power for purposes of ego inflation does not result in a feeling of importance that brings true inner satisfaction.

A child feels important even without help from the outside. His real might is deplorably small but he overcomes his limitations with his strong imagination. Some people attain a feeling of importance only in their dreams and daydreams. They are emotionally rather stunted and seldom become active in the pursuit of real power. The man of benevolent action takes his dreams of power and makes them into useful realities. Others merely dream of power and can never do anything to make them a living and purposeful reality. Dreams of power and importance are not always identical.

It is quite natural that being important is interpreted differently by different people. For some, being important means belonging to a certain group, class, creed, or country. For many women it means being a married woman, a wife, a mother, which is the attaining of a definite social status. For young girls it means having many friends, particularly boy friends, which is indicative of popularity. For a small storekeeper it may mean possessing the largest store in town with all the prestige that goes with it. For a rabid golfer it means a consistently good score; for a baseball player, getting the most home runs.

The nature of our striving for importance that is socially useful depends upon the intensity of our co-feeling with others. Co-feeling is a term invented by Dr. Alfred Adler, the founder of individual psychology. By co-feeling he meant a feeling of community or cooperation. Co-feeling and the striving for importance are not necessarily equal in drive. In many people the striving for importance is weaker than their co-feeling. In others, both factors are strong. These are the people who most earnestly try to be socially useful. In still others, both factors are weak. At any rate, our true importance depends just as much on the intensity of our co-feeling as on the intensity of our striving.

The greater the individual's co-feeling, the greater is the sociality of his striving and the greater is the satisfaction he will derive from it. Altruism is a potent factor in striving for importance. Importance must be attained in the eyes of others and not merely in ourselves for any real meaning of the term. Co-feeling automatically makes the striving for importance a positive factor, bringing satisfaction to oneself as well as to others.

Normal individuals, when they are discouraged, will stop striving for themselves alone, and will strive only with others. Striving for importance for oneself does not mean belittling others. We do not attain importance by debasing others. All human beings are important; all human lives are significant.

The striving for importance calls for reaching out for greater knowledge, profounder wisdom, real values. By means of these, the individual makes the fullest use of his powers, enlarges upon them, and increases his usefulness in society.

By striving for importance one naturally is called upon to develop his given potentialities. This gives rise to the inherent urge to grow, to increase in usefulness and dignity as an individual. All normal people have the capacity as well as the will to develop their potentialities and thus attain real importance.

In most cases attaining a sense of importance means also the attaining of security. Security means the fulfillment of a person's wishes for prestige, that is, the acceptance by and the respect of society as well as the achievement of self-respect. Security also means a person's being able successfully to use his powers, skills, and abilities for interpersonal goals within the range of his interests.

Attaining a sense of importance also means self-realization. By self-realization is meant a person's use of his talents, skills, and powers to his own satisfaction within the realm of his own freely established realistic sense of values. It also means the ability to reach out for and to find fulfillment of his needs for satisfaction and security as they can be attained without interfering with the law or needs of his fellow men.

When a person has attained a sense of importance he has also gained a reinforced sense of reality, a development of a feeling of responsibility, and a substitution for a latent hatred of a feeling of mutual good will. All of this can be gained by the conscious evolution of a feeling for the commonweal and the conscious destruction of the will to dominate others.

In closing, we may state the importance of feeling important as follows: (1) Our satisfaction and happiness depend to a great extent upon our importance. We attain importance not in ourselves, but only in the eyes of others. Essentially, this implies cooperative living with others. (2) Our importance depends upon what we mean or signify to others. They will admit,

approve, or admire only such importance as is beneficial to them. They will not admit or will disapprove and despise any importance which is indifferent or harmful to them. (3) Being important also implies logical living. Logical living means living in accordance with the requirements of our own human nature and those of others. If we need importance and if attaining importance means getting it through attitudes and actions beneficial to others, then it is the only way we must live.

The Pope and the Rotary Club

PETER H. SAMSOM

On January 11, 1951, a decree was issued from the Vatican forbidding Roman Catholic priests to be members of Rotary Clubs or to attend their meetings; the decree added that while Catholic laymen are not forbidden to belong to Rotary, they are urged to be cautious in dealing with this movement. The most interesting reaction which has been forthcoming since this announcement of Roman Catholic policy has been the bewilderment of many Catholics, for this action of Rome places them in an often embarrassing and difficult position.

Rotary's President, a Quebec banker and a Catholic, protested that Rotary "does not seek to supplant or interfere with any religious organization. . . . Each Rotarian is expected to be a loyal member of the church or religious community to which he belongs, and personally to exemplify by his every act the tenets of his religion." Gen. Carlos Romulo of the Philippines expressed himself similarly, pointing out that in his homeland most Rotarians are Catholics. But Montreal's Archbishop expressed the unquestioning Catholic reaction by putting the order into effect immediately, saying "It's not up to me to interpret the Pope's announcements. When the Pope speaks, Catholics have nothing else to do but to accept his directives."

Fortunately the rest of us are not so bound to an unquestioning acceptance of a voice of authority which sounds so peculiar in the twentieth century. The question in countless minds, Catholic and non-Catholic, has been "Why Rotary?" The selection of Rotary for the displeasure of Rome seems a most peculiar choice. For a generation in America, Rotary has represented the last word in conservatism and respectability. In most American cities, Rotary draws its membership from the top layer of financial, business, and professional leadership. In the 49 years of its existence, Rotary has built up an excellent reputation through the 83 countries in which its 7,200 clubs are found, for civic responsibility and conscientious service according to the convictions of its upper-middle-class composition. Back in the 1920s, Sinclair Lewis lampooned Rotary in his novel *Babbitt,* as a stronghold of smug standpattism, a haven of back-slappers and boosters. But to have the Catholic Church take time out from its holy war on Communism to warn the Catholic millions against the designs of Rotary is another matter entirely! This implies that the most powerful church in the world sees something dangerous to its view of religion in this organization, and it is this which seriously troubles good Catholics the world over who every week gather with their fellows of other faiths and discuss problems of the day, and organize service projects for community betterment. What on earth is it that the Roman church finds objectionable here, they are asking?

A glance at Rotary's statement of principles does not help a bit, but rather deepens the mystery. Its ideals could not possibly be challenged, except on grounds of conventionality. "Service, not self" is the motto with which Rotary was founded in 1905, and Rotarians feel that this ideal comports fully with religion's ideals of love and brotherhood. Rotary's principles announce its interest in developing acquaintance and friendship, in high ethical standards in business and professional life, in the worth of all useful occupations, and in the advancement of international goodwill and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional men. What is there here to justify the Roman church in warning its flock to bear in mind Article 684 of Canon Law: "The faithful must guard against associations which are secret, condemned, seditious, suspect, or which try to escape the legitimate supervision of the Church"? Just what seems to be bothering the Holy Father?

The first clue we have to this odd little mystery is that this is not the first time the Catholic Church has favored the Rotary Club with its attentions. Back in 1929 a somewhat similar warning, though not nearly so strong, was issued by Rome, which said then that it was "not expedient" for Roman priests to join Rotary. At that time, the leading Jesuit magazine carried on a vigorous campaign against Rotary, and the main burden of its attack was that Rotary Clubs were too friendly with Masonry. The present decree makes no actual mention of Masonry, but the implication is clear that this is what is on Rome's mind, for the warning to Catholic laymen refers to "associations which are secret." The Vatican newspaper came through with an effort to explain the decree, as the barrage of surprised queries must have been terrific. Speaking of Rotary's purposes, it says "This lay spirit, and the religious indifferentism which easily derives from it, lend themselves in Rotary to infiltrations of masonic and other anti-clerical elements, as in fact has happened in some countries in which, through prevalent Masonic influence, the activities of the clubs have been carried on at variance with the activity and purpose of the Church." The Vatican press refers specifically to Spain, Holland, and "some Latin-American countries" as places where this has occurred, and goes on to remark that, should the Rotary Club in some local area be considered to be influenced by Masonry, the bishop may decide to order Catholics not to associate themselves with it, and that this general rule could be applied to clubs similar to Rotary.

Here, then, we have a concrete lead to explain why the Roman church is so worried about innocent-looking Rotary Clubs. For centuries the Masonic orders have been regarded by the Church as her sworn enemy. They have been expressly condemned by several papal

pronouncements, and Rome has accused the Masons of using symbolism that is a cloak for conspiracy against government and religion. If there is a connection between Rotary and Masonry, then the Church is at least acting consistently with its historical commitment against Masonry. Let us now dispose at once of this question of connection. We have the word of Rotary's President: "Rotary has absolutely no connection with Masonry, or with any other organization," and further, "Rotary is not a secret organization."

But we are not quite content to leave the matter there, for this is not the end of its implications. Rotary is being banned, it seems clear, because Rome presumes that it has connections with Masonry—but just what is there in Masonry to draw the holy fire from the son of St. Peter? We have a right to know why the Roman church is so concerned about the influence of Masonry. Rome has shown her hand again, and has exposed thousands of Rotary Clubs the world over to some vague suspicion of being against religion, and suspect of dark doings. Even if Rome should publicly apologize to the Rotary Clubs of the world—which she certainly should and which she certainly will not—in all honesty she has still some explaining to do before this affair can be forgotten. Reputable groups simply cannot be irresponsibly blacklisted in this way, even by the biggest Church in the world! That Church has not been honest enough to say openly that it has banned Rotary because it suspects it of Masonic connections, and has left it to its unofficial interpreter to bring out this key fact. So it remains for persons interested in public decency to call that Church to account.

A Church has no more right to slander a respected movement in public than a Senator has to slander an individual. The Church may crouch behind its protective cover of sacerdotal sanctity, just as some Senators skulk behind senatorial immunity. But public honesty and decency demand that we brush aside such subterfuges and take a frank look behind the false front that the authoritarian mind always hides behind. If the Church has only its legitimate interests at heart in this public attack on the reputation of a respected movement, then she has nothing to fear from such an inquiry as this, by whomever it may be conducted, for there is nothing here but an honest quest for truth—and the truth has not been told.

What is Masonry, that it should be attacked by a great Church? Masonic orders are spread all over the world, lodges of citizens associated in common devotion to high ideals of personal and social morality, and humanitarian service. They grew out of the ancient guilds of artisans who labored in building the great cathedrals of Europe and England from the twelfth century onward. These guilds were consecrated Christian groups which stressed fraternity, good works, and mutual helpfulness. When the building of the cathedrals declined, the nature and function of the guilds changed, though they continued active. They were soon influenced by the new currents of democratic political and religious thought in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and adapted themselves to the new outlook that revolted against state and churchly authority. Here they ran afoul of the Catholic Church, for they dared to become independent of it, deeming that there is no necessary place in religion for the apparatus of a hierarchy, sacraments, and creeds. Freedom of conscience and complete religious toleration were central in the modernized Masonic movement, which believed that a man's religious beliefs were his private business, and were interested more in the standards of personal and civic morality by which he lived. Masonry acknowledges faith in God as the "Great Architect of the Universe," and in the immortality of the human soul, but it refuses to see one religion as superior to another, much less as the one and only true faith! Masonry cultivates reverence for the Infinite, insists on a high moral code, promotes large philanthropies, and establishes friendships among many whom the churches have separated in their dogmatic insistence on an exact and exclusive religious belief. These ideals are expressed in the Masonic orders in a number of symbols and rituals drawn from the ancient craft of cathedral builders.

From its very inception as a movement independent of any church, Masonry in all its many forms has been strongly opposed by the Roman church. The Church has used most vigorous language in condemning it, declaring it a "grave sin" for a Catholic to join the Masons, Oddfellows, or any kindred group. Protestant churches, too, have resented Masonry's strength, and have criticized it because of its "secrecy." But Rome's antagonism is more deep-seated, and extends to the moral and religious features of the Masonic orders. This movement has labored consistently to protect the individual conscience and the inward moral life against autocratic governments and absolutist churches, and throughout the history of Masonry it has been an active champion of modernism, secularism, and democracy. Anyone who wonders about the secrecy of Masonic rituals need only bring to mind the centuries of active persecution which have often driven the movement underground for survival.

Masonry has always clashed with the clerical ambitions of the hierarchy, and the Roman church has recognized in it a movement which would undermine its authority. Does not Masonry regard religion as an inward, private matter for the free conscience of every man to decide for himself? Does it not teach that all religions must be freely and equally tolerated? And above all, does not Masonry accept the cultivation of moral and spiritual character as the very substance of religion? In these historic ideals of Masonry are to be found the reasons why the Roman church hates and fears it, for it obviously challenges the church's claim to be the only true vehicle of God's revelation to the world, and denies that true moral character is to be achieved only through the Catholic Church. Masonry by its very existence implies a criticism and a questioning of monopoly in religion and ethics. Men of all religious faiths and of none work together in harmony in Masonic lodges, and recognize no one compulsory avenue which all men must travel in the spiritual life. There is a Chinese Masonic lodge in Massachusetts which uses in its ritual the Hebrew-Christian Bible, the Mohammedan Koran, and the writings of Confucius. To a Catholic, this is rank heresy. The Roman church fights the liberalism and religious toleration of the Masonic orders wherever it can strike a blow at them. Indeed, Masonry is hated and suppressed wherever there are tyrants, for it represents one important expression of the democratic spirit. Masonry is sometimes accused of being anti-Catholic (by Catholics), but it is so only in so far as it is anti-tyranny and pro-freedom of conscience. Religious liberals should recognize in the Masonic orders a first-class ally in the struggle for a free society and democratic liberties.

Now, it is evidently with some notion that Rotary Clubs are connected with Masonry that this latest arrogance has issued from the Vatican. The edict may well be aimed more at Rotary in certain European countries than at American Rotary, and there may be more of a connection there between the two movements. If this is the case, then the Roman church should have had the elementary decency to say so plainly, and avoid the painful confusion it has caused. The Pope is surely destined to receive an impressive protest from those American Catholics who have the courage to point out that in the case of American Rotary, the Pope is not exactly infallible! It will be most interesting to see if the ban on Rotary in America is lifted.

But even if it is—and it is not easy to imagine the Vatican admitting itself even the slightest degree in error, after publicly committing itself as it has done—there remain some reasons why the Church may be quite naturally unhappy about the Rotary Club, and these reasons have nothing directly to do with Masonry. Rotary represents the kind of organization in the modern world that will always irritate an autocratic church and make it uncomfortable. Rotary, in common with all its fellow-service clubs, makes a definite point of being neutral in religious matters, and of making no inquiry of a man's personal religious faith, preferring no one religion over another. It implicitly treats all religions as having equal value. Roman Catholicism hates the Masonic orders because they do precisely this, because they encourage the dangerous idea that there is no one religion which has all the truth in its keeping, which all men must accept to be saved or to be justified in character. Is it not barely possible that the Church is merely once again making known its profound disapproval of this religious tolerance which the modern world has achieved at such great cost as one of its proudest possessions? Catholic priests must now sever their connections with Rotary Clubs. Is it possibly because in these fellowships, on a level of equality with other men of non-sacred professions and non-Catholic faiths, Catholic priests are considered by Rome to be unduly exposed to the influences of democratic thinking and mixing? Is it perhaps that in Rotary questions are sometimes discussed which have a religious aspect, and all sorts of views are freely expressed without any churchly control—and Catholic priests are put in a position of approving this sort of thing when they are members of such clubs?

A Congregational minister in Minnesota wrote a letter to the *Christian Century* expressing his feelings about this edict:

> Those who are in these clubs are shocked and sorry. We have enjoyed this fellowship with Catholic priests, and have universally respected them. They must feel that if this decision from above rested on a weighing of what good they could do their fellow-men in such contacts, as against what harm might be done to them, it is no flattery to them or to their office. I am sure that American Catholic priests will conform to this order with as much reluctance as their resignations will be received (sic). We frankly question the sincerity of this edict. It has been published that the motive was to keep priests from secularism and from worldliness. We shall believe that when we hear that priests and laity are asked not to vote in popular elections or exercise their influence in politics. Could it be that priests are getting ideas from these associations which the hierarchy dislikes? . . .

Once again Rome has shown her hand and asserted her authority, though this edict concerning Rotary is not in itself vastly important. What is important is that, even in this minor affair, the character of Catholic power is once again revealed for what it is—for autocracy strips itself naked to public scrutiny every time it makes a move, be its designs ever so subtle, or its motives ever so devious. What is actually happening here, in a small way, is that, as the editor of the *Christian Century* has pointed out, Rome is adding another barbed wire to the top of the fence which separates Catholic religion and Catholic culture from the rest of Humanity. One part of Vatican strategy today is to create a separate Catholic culture, as well as to protect the Catholic religion from competition. Therefore, in a score of ways, it seeks "to fence itself in, and to fence all others out." Rotary is but one of the influences in the modern world that tend to break down such barriers between men, and promote human and democratic fellowship across the boundary lines created by religions which once held men apart and ignorant of each other. Therefore, Rotary must not be allowed to play an approved part in the life of Catholics, and must play no part at all in the lives of Catholic priests. Catholics, and especially priests, must be protected from such worldly, secular, democratic, and equalitarian influences. They must have no opportunity to participate with their fellow men in associations which assume a mutual respect for all faiths on a basis of equality—because Catholic power stands or falls with the claim that it represents the one and only true faith, the one and only morality, the one and only salvation! Challenge this basic dogma, and you cut the ground out from under the whole pattern of Catholic power, politically, socially, culturally and religiously. Question this central claim to divine uniqueness, and the entire structure of arrogance crumbles to the ground!

When we have grasped this we are in a position to understand the most basic truth about totalitarian power, whatever form it takes, political or religious: the truth that behind arrogance there is always fear, behind dogmatism there is always insecurity. Catholic power, for all its proud pretensions, fears the winds of free thought as it fears nothing else on earth, and is under an obsessive compulsion to lash out against free ideas and free institutions for the simple reason that it is afraid of what democracy, open interchange of thought, and the spirit of free inquiry can do to the airtight mind it must insist upon in its people and its priests. Only a completely airtight mind can possibly believe in one Church, one truth, one salvation—and only one.

Yes, it is true, the Catholic Church considers it its religious duty to defend the faith as unique, and to advance its power as God's one true revelation in the world. And in a society which treasures religious freedom, even this undemocratic claim must be permitted freely to assert itself. But the corollary of Rome's freedom to throw its weight around is the democratic duty of others to question and challenge the validity of this arrogant claim! Protestants and other Americans have a social and religious duty to unite in active defense of their democratic institutions and equalitarian traditions, which are daily being attacked and encroached upon by this "state within a state," this Church which still thinks with a twelfth century mind in the twentieth century world. With full respect for the honest personal faith of the sincere, believing Catholic, free men must forthrightly and outspokenly resist this continual attack on the fundamental principles of democratic civilization by the political power of a Church which does not share the modern world's respect for these principles.

The Shackles of Family Affection

ETHEL S. BEER

When silver-haired Mrs. Foster married somewhat late in life, everybody said she deserved it. Apparently they considered it her reward for being a devoted daughter.

"Of course, I couldn't marry while mother was alive," Mrs. Foster explained. "She opposed every man I went with. Not that she would admit it. On the contrary she bemoaned the fact that her only daughter was single."

Mrs. Foster was just one of those individuals, young and old, serving their family year after year, often to the point of sacrifice or of limiting their development. Usually such behavior is accepted as a matter of course by society. Yet family attachment does not always deserve the aura that surrounds it today.

To be sure, family life is important in our civilization. Children expand and thrive best in the family. Old people gain protection from want and loneliness because of the family. The tenacity of the family merits praise. Even though disintegration occurs again and again, the family rightly remains the ideal. In spite of legal splits and a lack of understanding family feeling often lasts. And this force does a great deal to shape human beings. Relatives wield influence, both good and bad, over one another. Valuable as family affection is, it creates shackles. By no means does the family always provide fertile ground for independent thought and action, so essential to bring out each person's potentiality. The difficulty is that today's habits demand a less restrictive attitude in regard to the family. Frustration never stimulates the best in mankind. In keeping with the times, flexibility must replace the present family yoke. For only when the members of the family are unhampered themselves can they contribute to the larger struggle for freedom in this world.

The emotional tie between individuals in the same family is stronger than is generally realized. Even ill treatment does not always kill the bond between parents and children. Pretty and sensitive, Betty always claimed that her father was dead. Actually he had deserted, leaving her mother to support herself and three children, one of whom subsequently died. Yet years later when he returned—a broken old man—Betty gave him the finest care, including private treatment in a hospital, where he died.

"I felt I owed it to him," Betty stated warmly. "After all he was my father. It was worth it, too, to watch him," she added. "I don't believe he'd ever enjoyed anything as much as that clean room and bed. And he fairly lapped up the attention of the doctors and nurses."

Far from harboring a grudge against this father, who had caused her so much suffering in childhood, Betty felt a definite responsibility for him.

Both young and old share a keen sense of duty for relatives, even those outside the immediate family circle. Rosy-cheeked Mrs. Jensen, a widow in her sixties, has nobody close needing her attention. Her only child, a daughter, is far away. She has no grandchildren. Probably this is why she feels such a definite obligation for her grandnephew, a lively boy of two, whom she has cared for since infancy.

"I'm not going to let just anybody look after *my nephew,*" she insists firmly. "And my niece won't stop working although her husband earns plenty. I know her."

So Mrs. Jensen wears herself out attending to this small boy in order to protect him from strangers. But she forgets that she is also helping to deprive him of the due of every child—the intimate sharing of day-by-day doings with the mother—by making it easy for her niece to shirk this responsibility.

Of course, too much mothering—"smothering" as it is aptly called—can make children overly dependent. "Mama's boys" were real menaces in the army because they could not adjust. The same holds true in civilian life. Before the death of Mrs. Benton's mother, with whom she made her home after her parents' divorce, she had a certain amount of emotional security.

"Afterwards I was all broken up," she relates, which is understandable in view of the close relationship between the two.

Now Mrs. Benton, still pretty in her thirties, clings to her father, for whom she always had a certain fondness in spite of their separation since her early years. And she cannot extricate herself from this connection, although he does not give her the satisfaction her mother did. Nor does he help her regularly financially, which, as a divorcee with a little daughter to support almost entirely, she needs badly. Certainly Mrs. Benton adores her child. Only this protective role is not enough. She seeks somebody to rely on. The solution may be a second marriage, which Mrs. Benton is contemplating at present. However, she may be too involved emotionally with her parents, as some children are, for such a step to work.

Generally speaking, every child wants the approval of their parents as long as they live. But this attitude can go too far. Tommy, a husky young man in his thirties, dares not tell his mother about his intended marriage because he fears she will disapprove. Yet his solicitude for her has no foundation in intimacy during childhood. Tommy was brought up by nurses and governesses. Maybe this is the root of the difficulty. Tommy submits to his mother out of sentimentality and therefore cannot treat her honestly. Probably this reaction has delayed marriage for him so far. Tommy is dominated by the wish to please his mother much more than he should be at his age. Such adults do not always make successful partners in marriage, or they may never marry at all.

Some children are so wrapped up in their parents that they do not crave a life of their own. Cynthia—a tall blond with a large mouth—considered her mother, whom she had nicknamed "Jeanie," her best friend. And the two usually had their social dates together. In her last years "Jeanie" was an invalid, demanding a great deal of attention from Cynthia, which she gave willingly.

"Isn't her devotion beautiful?" a mutual friend asked me one day. I smiled, thinking what it had done to Cynthia. From a promising young girl she had become a painfully self-conscious, middle-aged woman, trying to be coy with men. What initiative had she left to rebuild her existence along more wholesome lines after the death of her "Jeanie"?

The power that parents have over their children is astounding. Bright-eyed Magda had ambition for practically everything but marriage. Yet her mother, whom she worshipped, could see nothing else.

"She's not strong. I worry about what will happen to her after I'm gone," the mother told everybody.

In reality Magda was absolutely capable of earning her living and constitutionally unfit for marriage. But she finally succumbed, believing that her mother knew best. Then followed several years of wedded misery from which Magda finally escaped by leaving her husband. Afterwards she had a hard pull resisting her mother, who wanted her to return to him. This time Magda won out. Years have passed since then. However, mother and daughter still are very close in spite of this bad experience.

Naturally the older generation sometimes are the victims of the family, too. Mrs. Brodsky, with her tired brown eyes, worked like a slave to support herself and her two sons.

"I'd rather wear my knees to the bone than accept charity," she announced after her husband's death. And that was more or less what she did, scrubbing for a livelihood. As the years progressed the struggle became increasingly hard. Mrs. Brodsky developed high blood pressure. One son had a mental upset in adolescence. The other had high ambitions and continued to study, while his mother toiled on. He was her pride and joy.

"You'll see, my Maxie, he'll be a swell doctor," she boasted. Ironically enough Max entered the medical profession at the expense of his mother's health. Yet she was content because he had accomplished his desire and raised the prestige of the family.

Often relatives make it hard to break the family pattern. Parents can mar their children's future by not encouraging them to live within their means. Fair-haired Hilda was married in high hopes in her early twenties. Sam, a stocky youth not much older, was a salesman in a shoe store. In due time he joined the army and Hilda returned to her parents, who took her back all too willingly.

"They're lonesome since all their children left. Besides it saves money," Hilda explained.

So Hilda and her baby occupied the room that she had had before marriage in her parents' luxurious apartment. All was very easy for Hilda. The tragedy was that when Sam was discharged from the army, she refused to go back to the simple household that he could afford. So the two were divorced. Today Hilda is a disillusioned bitter woman, making her home with her widowed mother and grabbing a date with any man. On the contrary, Sam has remarried: a sensible girl, willing to live on a plane he can support.

The interference of parents may discourage young couples from following their own ideas about their children, especially if these are different from the way they were brought up. Nancy, with the flower-like face, had always meant to take care of her own children although she and Bill, her husband, had had nurses and governesses. But when the first baby came, she had a hard time and arrived home in a frail condition. Immediately her mother stepped in and installed a nurse, saying it was a temporary measure, although she meant it to be permanent.

"Nancy's always been delicate," she told Bill, and when he remonstrated about the expense offered to pay for the nurse.

Since neither Bill nor Nancy wanted to hurt her feelings, the arrangement materialized. And as the family grew, Nurse became more and more a fixture. Thus both children and parents missed the close companionship that would have meant so much to all of them. Were these parents weak? Yes, to some extent. However, had there not been family pressure they might have worked things out better.

Even older people find it difficult to go against relatives dear to them. Mrs. Green, a widow no longer young, prefers living in another district, where she has more congenial friends. But her brother insists that she remain in her present neighborhood, because it is acceptable to his social set, although his sister mingles little with them. So, stupid as it may seem, Mrs. Green acquiesces.

Standards acquired in childhood are not shed easily. Somehow to do this seems like disloyalty to the family. Privilege in education is taken for granted in certain groups. Therefore, the children go to private school, if it can be afforded. Tom and Lisa had other ideas. Hence they moved to a community, where the public schools were notably good. Unfortunately they did not stay there long enough. By the time the children reached school age, the family had settled in a large city. Then and there the plans for a public school education for the youngsters vanished.

"How could they learn in such crowded classrooms?" rationalized Lisa. Yet her children had much more opportunity to supplement their knowledge at home in their excellent environment than many public school pupils. Democratic as Tom and Lisa were in other ways, they could not break the family pattern in education. Therefore, their children went to private school, just as the parents had.

Because solidarity exists in some families, any member can hurt another. Bertha's sister-in-law wanted her niece to have advantages according to her lights, which the parents could not afford. Her harping on these and her generous offer to pay for them, made Bertha distrust her own sense of values. Was she depriving her child, whom she adored? Perhaps her sister-in-law was right, since she was the elder. To resolve such dilemmas when emotion is involved is never easy.

Quite evidently the shackles of family affection penetrate our lives deeply. To be fond of relatives is natural. The danger lies in abnormally close attachment and feelings which blur our judgments. As is well-known, the traditional family is changing rapidly. In some cases deterioration exists, but by no means in all. Even the increase of divorce, so publicized today, may be a better solution than unhappy couples sticking together. Taking it from the woman's angle, her self-reliance now makes her less likely to endure the miseries she did in the past. As for single young men and women founding their own homes, this practice should prepare them better for marriage. In the last analysis, dwelling under the same roof does not always mean intimacy.

More and more the democratic family, in which all receive due consideration, is spoken about at present. Perhaps the shackles of family affection are an overlapping of the past, which will vanish if we honestly face the problem. Family devotion should benefit individuals, not force them into ways uncongenial to them. Give and take is essential in family relations. Even children are not always wrong, although many parents think they are. True affection in a family allows each member independence. Nevertheless they find joy in sharing experiences. The family can and should enrich our lives. The world will be a better place when families are joined together by bonds of real love.

Alexander Pushkin: A Liberal Poet in Bondage

LEONARD B. GRAY

Russians greatly admire and love Pushkin and consider him their greatest poet. In their minds their great novelists have never overshadowed their favorite poet and among them today his fame is growing. He is their Shakespeare and they rank him among the major poets of all time. Outside of Russia he is not widely known and appreciated, largely due to the fact that no adequate translation of his poems has ever been made. While an increasing number of non-Russians are recognizing and appreciating his genius, not many, if any, of this number—even of those who are inclined to name him one of the great poets of the early part of the nineteenth century—agree with the Russians that he merits a place among the major poets of history.

But Pushkin may be greater than most readers of him outside of Russia think, since so national is his genius, many claim, that to understand and feel this poet fully one must be born and reared on Russian soil. The nationality of this poet's works, it is asserted, makes the fact that he is largely untranslatable not the only reason for people outside the boundaries of Russia missing the essence of his genius, for even foreigners who read him in the original often miss the full meaning and spontaneity and flavor of his poetry. Our major concern in this article, however, is not Pushkin's place among the poets, but rather the greatness he attained amid the bondages that hampered and restricted the expression of his genius. This is the wonder that amazes and puzzles us.

As with Robert Burns and not a few other creative writers, Pushkin's life was an endless discord between his inner spiritual being and the external facts of his existence, but this discord in the latter's case seems to have been worse than those of any other such writers we know. Burns, hard pressed as he was by unfavorable circumstances, did not have the government of his country oppressing his genius, while Pushkin's creative spirit was hindered to a large degree by the Russian civil authorities. Nor did his family make it so hard for the Scottish poet to write as the parents and the wife of the Russian did for him. Indeed, there is no little evidence that the hard conditions surrounding Burns did much indirectly to bring his genius to a wonderful flowering, while this was certainly not so with Pushkin. Likely this difference in the effects of severe external circumstances upon the inner lives and poetic productions of the two poets was largely due to the fact that the two men, for the most part, wrote out of and about entirely different subject matters. The one in Scotland for the most part wrote out of and about his personal ill fortunes and his reactions to the severe conditions around him, while the one in Russia found his themes chiefly in the contemporary conditions of his country and in periods of Russian history other than his own. It is not difficult to understand that what Burns wrote out of incites great writing and that the study and research work required to do much of Pushkin's writing would be made difficult by the fear and anxiety that government oppression and an unhappy home life created in his mind. As a matter of fact we know that the Scottish poet wrote most of his great poems during the hardest period of his life, and that the Russian produced only a few of his best works during his most difficult years. The latter did at times write poems that expressed his personal reactions to oppressive conditions but, if fear of persecution by the government had not prevented him doing so, much of the time, likely he would have found more emotional health and also written more great poetry.

Anyway, regardless of the extent to which we may be right in explaining the difference of effect of hard external conditions upon these two poets and their writing, we do know that the influences that put Pushkin in bondage and clipped the wings of his independent, creative spirit much of the time and to no small degree were exile, police surveillance, government interference, adverse material circumstances, unsympathetic parents, unhappy married life for which his frivolous wife was largely responsible, not a few personal enemies, and the poet's inability to manage his own affairs. The wonder is that his essentially simple and good impulses, the beauty of his spiritual nature, and his genius broke through the many severe bondages put upon him as often as they did. In an age and a country that were hard for poets, especially for one of Pushkin's freedom-loving spirit, Russia's greatest poet appeared and left an enduring contribution.

The noble and aristocratic family into which our poet was born in Moscow on May 26, 1799, put the first bondage on his genius. He was an unloved child of pleasure-loving parents who, when they did not treat him with misunderstanding and neglect, were cold and harsh to him. But amid the unfavorable conditions in his home there were compensations and consolations in his understanding and sympathetic grandmother, Marya Alekseeva, and his wise and kind old nurse, Arina Rodionova, who told him many fairy stories and fostered in his mind a love for the folklore of his native country which was to give him inspiration and subject matter for some of his greatest poems and prose works. And there were the boy's French tutors and his father's fine library well-stocked with the works of the great liberal eighteenth century French authors. As his parents neglected him the youngster spent many sleepless nights poring over Voltaire, Molière, Racine, and La Fontaine, and thereby letting the seeds of liberalism and love for freedom take deep root in his mind. He was no more than eight when he began writing verses after the manner of the French poets.

At the newly-founded Lyceum located in one of the annexes of the Tsarskoe imperial palace near St. Petersburg, which the boy entered at the age of twelve, young Pushkin's liberal tendencies were encouraged and developed. Amid their usual autocratic and oppressive policies there were now and then a few liberal and progressive elements in some of the Czars, especially in Alexander I. During his intensely liberal phase, the latter founded this Lyceum chiefly for the children of the nobility, little dreaming that his pet institution was to become a large factor in making a poet far more liberal than its founder. In this phenomenal and almost unbelievable school, corporal punishment was prohibited; professors of a decidedly liberal spirit taught, and the students were encouraged to do independent thinking and to write poetry according to their own initiatives. Here the free spirit of the youthful Pushkin flourished and blossomed.

Near the Lyceum in 1815 many of the guards' regiments were stationed and not a few of the officers of

the Hussars were imbued with a revolutionary spirit. Among these officers young Pushkin and some of his fellow students struck up friendships and found ample opportunity to discuss political questions.

The young poet's liberalism was further fostered by membership in two liberal clubs, first "The Argamas" to which many of Russia's prominent authors belonged, and then "The Green Lamp" whose meetings, while mostly devoted to the reading of literary productions, occasionally considered a political paper. Indeed, at this time in Russia, there was a close alliance between literature and politics and throughout his career we see this alliance in the mind and literary productions of Pushkin. It was during his membership in "The Green Lamp" that our poet wrote most of the poems and epigrams—some of which were aimed at the Tsar himself—that eventually roused the authorities to send him into exile in 1820. His two most daring poems of this period were "The Village" in which appear these lines:

> Will serfdom be abolished at a ruler's nod?
> Shall I see the long-awaited dawn of freedom
> Rising above our fatherland?

And "Ode to Freedom," which appear these lines:

> Now tremble, despots of the world!
> And you awakened slaves,—
> Listen, take heart and revolt!

In spirit Pushkin joined the Decembrists who were not only the actual participants in the revolution that failed on December 14, 1825, but also a large circle of sympathizers and adherents found chiefly among the flower of the Russian gentry and intelligentsia. Even though he usually favored more intelligent and moderate development than violence and revolution as a way to reform, the conspirators testified that their liberal idealism had been inspired by Pushkin's political verse, and the poet, according to his own admission, was sufficiently aroused at the time to have taken part in the Decembrist uprising had he been in St. Petersburg.

Pushkin's liberal poems could not be printed because of the censorship, but many of them were widely circulated, and some of them, including "Ode to Freedom," got into the hands of the civil authorities. This meant exile. It was really just this, and the poet and his friends knew it, although it was called a transfer from a minor position as clerk in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which Pushkin held at the time in St. Petersburg, to a similar one in South Russia. Four years later, in 1824, he was suddenly dismissed from the Civil Service and deported to his father's estate at Mikhailovskoye in the Province of Pshio in the northwestern part of the country where he was kept under police surveillance.

Look at our poet during those years of his exile! He is a short man with a muscular body developed by vigorous exercise. His shock of dark hair, swarthy complexion, flat nose, thick lips, and two rows of large glistening teeth make him almost as unattractive as he was in early childhood when his parents derisively called him an ugly duckling. And yet his unusually expressive face animated by brilliant eyes, his wit and humor, and his rare conversational powers give him a certain attraction. He wins strong personal friends and strong personal enemies. He spends much time in the gay life of aristocratic houses, in love affairs, and in small groups of liberal thinkers. During the long winter evenings he reads an enormous amount of history and much poetry, especially that of Byron whose influence he is under. He keenly feels his lonely life, and longs for St. Petersburg and Moscow. He is constantly annoyed by the police and officials, at times by special agents that the Tsar sends to spy on him. And, above all, his intellectual and poetical powers blossom to maturity, and he writes considerable poetry, including a large portion of his long novel in verse, *Eugene Onegin,* which many people call his masterpiece. After the Decembrist Revolt, especially after its five ringleaders were hanged on July 13, 1826, the poet in exile fears that he, too, may be numbered among the revolutionaries and executed. He burns many of his more liberal poems and all papers relating to the activities of secret societies. Indicating an intense obsession on his part, the exile frequently draws the profiles of people connected with the revolt and pictures of a gallows with five men hanging on it, a habit he is to continue for a few years after he is liberated. Another habit he forms is that of mixing verses he dare not publish by writing consecutive lines in the corners of the pages of his manuscripts. One example of this manner of writing on his part was not discovered until 1910, when P. O. Morozov deciphered a portrayal of the Decembrist movement. Originally a part of the tenth chapter of *Eugene Onegin* Pushkin, apparently from fear of the police finding it, burned this bit of writing and never rewrote it except in the manner Morozov found it.

On September 3, 1826, the Tzar, by means of an Imperial Courier, ordered the exiled poet to set out for Moscow. Five days later the political suspect was taken to the Kremlin and presented to the Tsar of all the Russians. Little is known of what took place at that famous interview. But evidently Pushkin agreed to knuckle to the authorities. We know that henceforth he often praised the government, especially in his long poem, "Poltava," in which he celebrates Imperial Russia. If he became a political conservative during the last years of his life, as some people claim, likely it was only outwardly, for while not a few liberals become conservative as they grow older they seldom do so as young as the poet was. And what is more, we do know that the "New Pushkin," as the Tsar once called him, occasionally sent letters of encouragement to his personal friends among the Decembrists and secretly used what influence he could on their behalf.

It seems plain that the wings of this independent, creative spirit were clipped even more than they had been during the years of his physical exile. One of the literary tragedies in Russia throughout most of its history, especially under the Soviet Government, I understand, has been the tyranny that the ruling powers have exercised over the minds of great creative writers in that country. This tyranny has meant, and is meaning, suicide on the part of some writers, exile for others, and a lot of money for those who consent to write on behalf of the Government.

Pushkin's last bondage and the chief cause of his early death came through his marriage to Natalya Nikolaevna Goncharova, a silly, frivolous, pleasure-loving young girl of great beauty. She had almost no intellectual ability and no appreciation of her husband's literary work. She was a great favorite with the Tsar and the whole Court. She led her husband into a ceaseless round of gay, insipid social activities which he hated. She continually harassed his mind by her flirtations. Gay society, unhappy home life, jealous agony, huge debts incurred chiefly by the high social position he was obliged to maintain, and the restrictions the

government continuously imposed upon him left him little time and peace of mind for writing. It is a remarkable fact, however, that during this period, the most harrowing in his life, he wrote *The Bronze Horseman* which is even a greater work than *Eugene Onegin,* in the opinion of some people. But he produced little else of worth amid the influences that bound his person and spirit at this difficult time.

It does not seem that his wife was immoral but her careless flirtations finally brought about a situation that Pushkin could not endure without doing something about it. As with many of her admirers she allowed and perhaps encouraged the persistent attentions, carried on even after his marriage, of Georges d'Anthès, a French émigré and a handsome, dashing young officer of the Guards, who was a great favorite at the Russian Court. The humiliating and harassing situation brought about a duel between the poet and this young officer on February 8, 1837. Pushkin was mortally wounded and died two days later. Even though he loved life too much to have welcomed the bullet, despite the meshes of his unhappy life, this lover and advocate of the freedom he never had was, at last, freed from all earthly bondages, and his name, literary greatness, and humanitarian contributions found freedom in that immortality that true poets desire—"on the lips of living men."

The name and the influence of Pushkin endure and likely will endure throughout time. No more than a quarter of a century had passed when a Russian critic wrote, "Pushkin is our all." Today the Russian people join their literary critics in giving their favorite poet either first place or a place second to none among their authors. Singularly enough, at the centenary of his death both the Dispersion and the Soviet Russia claimed him for their own. To the former, blinking its eyes at his revolutionary ideas, he was the symbol of the nation's cultural traditions and the pledge of its renewal. To the latter, he was the rebel poet against the tyranny of the Czars and a writer who possessed a buoyant, life-affirming quality expressing the attitude of the rising Social Class. But the poet does not belong altogether to either, for he wrote against the serfdom of the old Russia and he advocated the freedom and the dignity of man found in neither the old or the new. And yet all Russians since his death are justified in revering Pushkin, as the writer who did the most to shape their literary language and to father their literature, and to give each succeeding generation of young Russian authors its best model.

Pushkin's national genius continues to be the cornerstone of literary Russia. He continues to hold the interest of his countrymen by his thoroughly Russian spirit and terrific realism, and he charms them, especially through his poetry, by his spontaneity and technical felicity. His interest in character, his awareness of people in their social setting, and his feeling for the minutiae of town and country life, elements that make the fountainhead of the Russian novel, put the authors of his country in debt to him. Through these contributions, especially in that great verse-novel, *Eugene Onegin,* the first realistic novel of any importance in the history of Russian literature, Pushkin made a literary landmark by starting a wonderful development of Russian fiction in the nineteenth century. In giving us Tatyana, one of the noblest and most loved women in all literature, this verse-novel goes far beyond the boundaries of the poet's country and acquires an abiding place in the mind and heart of mankind. If Pushkin is ever to attain the rank of a world poet, Tatyana would likely be the chief reason for this attainment on his part. *The Captain's Daughter,* a piece of Historical fiction which resurrects the age of Catherine and the poet's greatest achievement in the opinion of Tolstoi, contains the best of its author's character drawing and is generally considered his most excellent prose contribution. With some qualities of *War and Peace* and with a chaste and simple style, this story has had a great and happy influence upon generations of Russian writers.

Whether or not the world at large will ever give Pushkin the high place in literature that the Russians do, we cannot say. But many people throughout the world can give him a recognition as a champion of liberty that the people of his own country do not give and cannot give with their present type of mind. The contributions to love of freedom that the greatest of Russian poets made has seeped to no small degree into the corporate life of mankind. His continuing influence has joined the permanent influences of Voltaire and Jefferson and many others in fighting tyranny over the mind of man. And yet the freedom he championed is ebbing in the world today, not only in countries dominated by Communism, but also in others, including our own. The tide of liberty in America is ebbing through fear of dangers without and through the oppressions exercised by special interests and by public opinion within. The mass opinion of the public that is placing an increasing number of restrictions upon our expression of ideas and upon our protests against wrongs is the greatest dictator in our country. The power exercised by this dictator is the chief reason why Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas can truthfully say: "The pulse beat of freedom is feebler now than at any time in the history of the United States."

The growing opposition throughout the world to Pushkin's human values and love for liberty incites us to claim that while we are unable to appreciate him fully as a literary artist we can and ought at least rise up with greater courage and strength to resist the chief influences that held this great lover of freedom in bondage.

The Study Table

An Undreamer

PROTEUS AND OTHER POEMS. *By Phyllis-Anne Steinberg. New York: Pageant Press. 66 pp. $2.00.*

A housewife and mother has stirred up a batch of pleasing poems which reach both sublime heights and occasional depths. The subject matter is that of home and children, coyotes and hot days in Texas; and there is the long poem, "Proteus," which brings man and god into the same intimacy as in *Green Pastures.* In the verbal encounter, man comes off something the victor . . . "you'd better go along with men, if you would be a god again." For, once man overcomes *fear,* he will have no further use for the gods. Phyllis-Anne Steinberg is willing to settle for *nature* as her god, seeing in it the inspiring teacher and friend.

She writes poetry because she likes it—wants to make it more accessible. This makes her homespun poems likeable. She is not a dreamer, but—to use a word of her own coinage—an *undreamer.*

HAROLD P. MARLEY.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

YOU CAN HELP!!!

Does your Service Committee, Social Action Committee, Alliance, League Group and Youth Group want a practical project? Here is one which will make a real contribution to a great institution.

Abraham Lincoln Centre, founded by Unitarians, liberal Jews, and others in 1905, celebrates its Fiftieth Anniversary next year. At the same time it faces a major financial problem. After fifty years of service it has become necessary to completely replace the elevator with an entirely new one. The cost will be well over $21,000.00. Obviously this is more than a budgetary operation. To take this amount from endowment would seriously cripple one of the major sources of its annual income. Extra contributions from friends of the Centre are needed.

Abraham Lincoln Centre has pioneered in the Settlement House and Social Service fields. It has made vital and constructive contributions to the lives of thousands of young people on Chicago's South Side. Its founder, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, and its present Dean, Curtis W. Reese, in addition to their furtherance of social welfare, have given outstanding leadership and exceptional service to the Western Unitarian Conference and the Unitarian Movement. For the past thirteen years the Centre has provided office space for the Headquarters of the Western Unitarian Conference at a nominal cost to the Conference.

Our churches, fellowships, their members and friends now have an opportunity to express practical appreciation to the Abraham Lincoln Centre for its long, consistent, and faithful devotion to true democracy and genuine brotherhood. Any contribution, large or small, will be received gratefully.

You can help!

GENEVA CONFERENCE—1954

Those who attended the Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly at College Camp on "beautiful Lake Geneva" and those to whom they have reported know the enthusiasm for, and value of, this year's program. Space does not permit summarizing the lectures, courses, and workshops. However, the following information may give some indication of the breadth of interest.

There were representatives present from—

40 Unitarian churches
1 Universalist church
8 Unitarian Fellowships

A breakdown of the registration shows—

71 High School Students (LRY)
(21 Boys, 50 Girls)
13 Ministers
102 Laymen
175 Women
101 Children

462—Total Registration

This is the second largest attendance in the seventeen-year history of the Midwest Summer Assembly. The largest attendance was in 1948 when there were 511 registered. A quick appraisal of these figures indicates the need for increased proportional representation on the part of High School boys and ministers. Noteworthy was the large increase in the proportion of laymen present. Since Geneva is set up as a family-style conference it was gratifying to have forty-three families (father, mother, and children) on the grounds. There was a marked decrease in the number of daily visitors and a marked increase in the number who stayed for all or the majority of the time scheduled. It was a great conference!

Geneva next year—June 26 to July 2, 1955.

Plan now to attend!

GENEVA PLANNING COUNCIL

The Planning Council for the Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly for next summer's conference met in Chicago, September 17 and 18, 1954. The officers and members of the Council are:

Max D. Gaebler, Madison, Wisconsin: Chairman
Albert Hayes, First Church, Chicago: Vice-Chairman
Esther L. Heinrich, Third Church, Chicago: Secretary and Registrar
Charles W. Phillips, Des Moines, Iowa: Program Director
Randall S. Hilton, Chicago: Treasurer and Business Manager
Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Indianapolis, Indiana
Mrs. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Indianapolis, Indiana
Mrs. Hadley Grimm, St. Louis, Missouri
Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, First Church, Chicago
Blythe Conn, Burlington, Iowa

CONFERENCE R. E. COMMITTEE

The President of the Western Unitarian Conference announces the appointment of the following persons to the Religious Education Committee:

Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, Chicago, Chairman
Mrs. Harry Adams, Kansas City, Missouri
Mrs. Edwin T. Buehrer, Chicago
Mrs. Paul Caskey, Rockford, Illinois
Rev. Russell Lincoln, Birmingham, Michigan
Mrs. Calvin Osborne, Cincinnati, Ohio
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer, Indianapolis, Indiana
Mr. Ronald Walrath, Chicago

The committee met in Chicago, September 11.

CONNOLLY ON BOARD

Mr. C. David Connolly, Rockford, Illinois, has been elected to the Board of Directors of the Western Unitarian Conference to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Mrs. Robert Dubin. Mr. Connolly is an active member of the Rockford church and is President of the United Unitarian Appeal.

COUNCIL OF LIBERAL CHURCHES

The Council of Liberal Churches put its Division of Education into operation on July 1st. Rev. Ernest W. Kuebler, former Executive Vice-President of the American Unitarian Association, is the Director of the Division and acting Executive Director of the Council. Miss Frances Wood and Rev. Edna Bruner have been retained as Field Workers. A diligent search is being made for a Director of Adult Education and a Curriculum Editor. It is hoped that these positions will be filled in the near future.

UNITED UNITARIAN APPEAL

During the 1953-54 Appeal Campaign $246,268 was raised. The Goal for the 1954-55 campaign is $369,000—a fifty percent increase. Unitarians can make this goal if they really try. If the current advance of the Unitarian Movement is to be maintained and a dynamic Council of Liberal Churches is to be established, this amount—$369,000—must be raised.

What is the $123,000 in new money to be used for? Here are some of the uses to which it will be put.

1. The Council of Liberal Churches plans the establishment of a completely new Department of Public Relations. Neither the Unitarians nor the Universalists are budgeting any money for the purpose at the present time. The Council also must meet the need for increased educational services which have been neglected during the past few years. This requires new money from Unitarians to meet the Unitarian share of this expense. To fail in raising it will seriously cripple the Council. To raise it will put the Council on a sound and constructive basis.

2. Unitarian pensions are a paltry pittance, a disgrace to the Unitarian Movement. We must raise much more than we have in the past in order to bring these pensions up to somewhere near a subsistence level. The increase this year will be a step in the right direction.

3. Youth Work has suffered greatly during the past few years. Now with the organization of the Liberal Religious Youth and its plans for a much more adequate program there is an urgent need for more money.

4. Regional offices are trying to keep abreast of the increase in organizations and activities. These increase costs. It has also made necessary the establishment of a new region with a full-time staff in the South.

5. New churches are coming into existence faster than they can be adequately financed. With promotion and planning, the opportunities are limitless. Twice before in history Unitarians muffed great opportunities. By raising more money we can meet the challenge.

Suggested shares for the churches are up fifty percent at least, depending on their budgets. This is going to seem difficult to many but it really is not asking as much from us as our neighboring churches are getting.

It costs money to be an advancing and dynamic Movement. Unitarians have had the largest percentage of growth of any denomination during the past five years. While the fastest growing, we are still the poorest in giving to our Cause. Opportunity is knocking at our door. We must open it.

AREA MEETINGS

Schedule for sub-regional area meetings this fall:

October 9—Rocky Mountain Conference—Colorado Springs

October 15-16—Abraham Lincoln Conference—Rockford, Illinois

October 22-23—Minnesota Conference—Rochester, Minnesota

October 22-24—Iowa-Nebraska Conference—Lincoln, Nebraska

October 30—Chicago Area Conference—Chicago

November 5-6—Michigan Area Conference—Detroit Central

November 7—Ohio Valley Conference—Cincinnati

HOME SERVICE PROJECTS

Mrs. Dudley Moore, Director of Home Service Projects for the Unitarian Service Committee, will conduct seminars and workshops on local service committee projects at the various Area Conferences.

FELLOWSHIP FIELD TRIP

Mr. Munroe Husbands, Director of Fellowships for the American Unitarian Association, will visit Minnesota, Michigan and other areas in the Western Conference during October and November.

NEW HYMNAL

A new Church School song book, *We Sing of Life,* will be published this Fall by the Beacon Press. It is edited by Vincent B. Silliman, minister of the Beverly Unitarian Fellowship, Chicago. It is a beautiful book, being entirely hand-lettered. You can order it through the Conference office. Price $3.00.

NORTH CHURCH—INDIANAPOLIS

The North Unitarian Church, Indianapolis, Indiana, which was organized in 1950, voted in June to disband. John K. Hammon, its minister since 1951, has accepted a call to the Unitarian Church in Hopedale, Massachusetts.

OF PERSONS AND PLACES

Mrs. CARL A. SCHAAD, of the Conference Office, was Registrar for the Alliance Leadership Training Conference, Silver Bay, New York. . . . CLARK WELLS, Director of the Channing Club, First Church, Chicago, and a June graduate of Meadville, has become Assistant Minister at Oklahoma City. . . . ROMAN HRUSKA, former President of the Iowa Unitarian Association, former member of the Board of Directors of the A. U. A. and Congressman from Omaha, has been nominated on the Republican ticket for the United States Senate. . . . GRANT BUTLER left his position as Director of the Department of Extension of the A. U. A. September first. His new address, Ninette, Manitoba, Canada. Grant and Calla are tending to family obligations and taking over personal management of their rear-round hostelry. Good fishing, hunting. . . . GAYNOR HILTON wants her friends to know that she is home after three weeks in the hospital and improving nicely. . . . RALPH FUCHS of the Bloomington (Indiana) Fellowship, was visiting professor in the Law School at the University of Chicago during the Summer Quarter. . . . HOMER JACK returned from an auto trip to Alaska to open his church for three Sundays during the meetings of the World Council of Churches in Evanston. Speakers were visiting dignitaries from overseas. . . . WAITSTILL H. SHARP is now at 2211 Ripley Street, Davenport, Iowa. . . . PARK FOREST FELLOWSHIP has voted to seek church status and secure a minister as soon as possible. A membership and finance drive was started in August. . . . BISMARCK, N. D., FELLOWSHIP writes that WILLIAM D. HAMMOND, minister at Grosse Pointe, Michigan, stopped by on his vacation trip again this summer to conduct a service for them. They are most appreciative of his interest and help. . . . NORTH SHORE FELLOWSHIP has changed its meeting place from Deerfield to the Masonic Hall in Highland Park, Illinois. . . . BLOOMINGTON, Illinois, is planning a special drive to raise $10,000 to match a bequest to the church of that amount. . . . ST. LOUIS plans to establish a branch church to be located in St. Louis County.

NOTE BENE

The new Social Security Act extends coverage to ministers on a voluntary basis, beginning January 1, 1955.